

**Responses to Comments in Letter 134 from Mary Barrett,
Washington State Attorney General's Office**

*Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown
in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.*

1. Please see General Response H for discussion of the diesel fuel tank.
2. As discussed in General Response E, in the event that nitrate concentrations increase above applicable federal, state, or local water quality standards after the project goes online, the applicant is proposing to pay for a treatment system for the Sumas municipal well field in order to achieve regulatory standards for drinking water. Groundwater quality monitoring, designed specifically to detect nitrates among other constituents, is and will continue to be performed by the City of Sumas as a condition of their water right. This should provide sufficient lead time to alert the City of the need to acquire a treatment system.
3. Robinson & Noble performed an analysis to evaluate the cone of depression that could potentially result in impacts to nearby residential wells and water rights. As discussed in General Comment D, that analysis has been used by the applicant to identify wells that they would agree to mitigate if the existing use is impaired.
4. See Letter 162, Response to Comment 1 for discussion of transmission grid capacity.
5. The applicant proposes to install and operate continuous emission monitors to measure concentrations of NO_x, CO, and O₂ in each exhaust stack. In addition the applicant has agreed to fund an air quality monitoring station that would be operated by staff from the Greater Vancouver Regional District, Ministry of the Environment, or the Northwest Air Pollution Authority, depending on where the station was located. Reporting and other emissions monitoring requirements would be incorporated into the operating permit for the facility.
6. Please see Letter 65, Response to Comment 1 for a discussion of greenhouse gases and potential mitigation measures proposed for the project.
7. Please see General Response I, which discusses a revised approach that has been developed to deal with discharge of wastewater from the project
8. Several comment letters suggested the use of GE's H System because of its improved efficiency. Although installations of the H System are now planned, they are viewed as prototypes from which performance data will be developed. At this time, the units are not considered by GE to be commercial.